

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. IX, NO. 26

JULY 10, 1961



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

How the U.S. Could Regain the Initiative in Foreign Policy

Our present foreign policy difficulties are largely of our own making. We are as imprisoned by taboos as a primitive tribe. In discussing Germany, it is not respectable to bring up the possibility that the Germans (whom we have had to fight twice in one generation) may again prove a greater menace than the Russians; so the idea of swapping an atom-free demilitarized Reich for Russian withdrawal from East Europe has been shelved as politically unmentionable. In the Far East, where Formosa represents a similar problem of how to hold an ultimately untenable outpost, we are afraid to examine realities because our political leaders are frozen stiff with fear of Chiang's China Lobby, and our public has been taught to see Communist China as a hobgoblin. Here are some ways in which we could seize the initiative in foreign policy if we had the capacity to break out of our own self-imposed obstacles:

Like Hearst's Yellow Peril

¶ The Russians have become as adept as ourselves in the technique of the calculated leak. The most sensational in a long time is that of a purported secret letter from Moscow to foreign Communist parties accusing Mao Tse-tung of disloyalty, subversion and "incitement to World War III." The letter, as disclosed by Isaac Deutscher, Stalin's biographer, in the London *Sunday Times* (July 2) and reprinted in the *Washington Post* (July 5) is another variant of a theme on which Khrushchov has often played. This says, "I have to be intransigent because the Chinese are breathing down my neck" and "give me a token victory at least on Berlin so I can fight off the advocates of a 'hard' line who look for leadership to Peking." Moscow in a new form is subtly exploiting the fear Wm. Randolph Hearst popularized many years ago as the "yellow peril." Of course, the Russians do not do it overtly, but they get the same effect by accusing the Chinese in this "secret letter" of trying to divide the Communist world into Western and Eastern zones, the latter under Chinese hegemony, a division Moscow rejects as carrying "a flavor of racialism."

But why should we be dependent on leaks from Moscow to know what the Chinese are thinking? Why shouldn't we be free to play it either way—to save Mao from the Russians if that suits our national interest instead of "saving" Khrushchov from the Chinese. The secret letter blames Mao for Khrushchov's hardened line on a nuclear test ban. But it is not at all impossible that Russia could be outflanked on the nuclear test issue through China if we really wanted a test ban. Peking has several times offered an "atom free" Pacific. This proposal, rudely rejected by State Dept. spokesmen without reflection, would seem to imply that China would be prepared to renounce nuclear weapons if we were

No Other Labor Movement Like It

We see from the July 1 issue of the AFL-CIO News that the AFL-CIO Executive Council at its latest get-together in the Poconos called for renewed nuclear testing, no compromise on Berlin (it criticized that radical, Mike Mansfield, for suggesting a "free city" as a way out), emergency powers for the President, and steps to arouse the U.S. public and stiffen Britain and France (whom the Council regards as too soft on the subject). In addition, it called for stronger OAS action against Cuba. In every other country of the free world—even West Germany—the labor movement is always annoying the government by talking about the danger of nuclear war or some such topic but here, thanks to George Meany and Jay Lovestone, it stands in every crisis firmly to the right of the Vatican and slightly to the left of Barry Goldwater, somewhat wary of Kennedy as it was of Eisenhower (both suspect for appeasement), and wholly in accord only with Konrad Adenauer.

to make the Pacific an atom free zone. This would be popular in Japan and throughout Asia. A few improved Russian warheads will not change the world balance of power; nuclear weapons in Chinese hands will shake the world. Now, before Peking has the bomb, is the time to negotiate. China's famine is the greatest opportunity ever offered our Food for Peace program. Recognition, coupled with a face-saving formula for an autonomous Formosa, set in the grand design of an atom free Pacific, enforced by a treaty for mutual inspection against nuclear testing would make it impossible for Russia to continue lone resistance to effective safeguards. This is how a modern Richelieu, as free from ideological nonsense as the great French Cardinal was from theological prejudice, would play the political cards to safeguard America's long range interests in a stable Pacific and in preventing the creation of a solid Russo-Chinese bloc dominating Eurasia.*

¶ Another way to free ourselves for effective foreign policy action is to end the one-sided presentation of the nuclear testing issue. Two illustrations of this may be found in a little noticed speech Senator Humphrey made to the Senate June 29. Humphrey revealed that the President "has received

(Continued on Page Four)

* That Kennedy is capable of such perspectives was indicated when he told the Senate June 14, 1960, that some way ought to be found to bring the Chinese into the nuclear test talks "because Chinese possession of atomic weapons could drastically alter the balance of power" and added "if that contact proved fruitful, further cultural and economic contact could be tried. For only in this way can we inform ourselves of Communist activities, attempt to restore our historic friendship with the Chinese people. . . ."

Contrasting Speeches by Fulbright and Rostow Reflect A Great Debate . . .

Last May 15 Jim Lucas in a Scripps-Howard series from Fort Bragg, N.C. on the Army's so-called Special Forces for guerrilla warfare said its command "appears to have an open line to the desk of a top presidential assistant at the White House." The description seems to fit Kennedy aide W. W. Rostow who spoke June 28 at the graduation exercises of the U.S. Army Special Warfare School at Fort Bragg. His speech, of which we give excerpts on page 3, is worth close study, especially in connection with a thoughtful address made in the Senate next day by Senator Fulbright, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee (see excerpts at the bottom of this page). Indeed on close reading of the two, I get the feeling of a debate within the Kennedy Administration.

New Adventures in North Viet-Nam?

Fulbright, the one top Administration figure who spoke out forcefully against the Cuban adventure, seems to be warning in his Senate speech against the possibility of similar new episodes and against the mentality behind them as expressed by Prof. Rostow. In this connection, there are signs of new war preparations against Cuba, either by exiles training here or collectively through the OAS, and of secret guerrilla projects elsewhere. The *Wall St. Journal* May 16 on "undercover warfare" plans in Washington said "Without going into secret details, indications can be reported that at least one such maneuver is being blueprinted at this moment for execution in a vital nation distant from Cuba." That may be North Viet-Nam.

For all his sophistication and scholarship, Prof. Rostow engages in self-delusion. He says "our central task in the underdeveloped areas is to protect the independence of the revolutionary process." He says we seek a world in which

The Press on The New Frontier

Before the Cuban invasion, exile forces were allowed to recruit and train in violation of neutrality laws and Florida newspapers suppressed the news until it leaked from other sources. The same process has begun again. Two groups of anti-Castro adventurers were identified by the Miami Herald June 27. It reported naively that their existence had been known by it for some days but that the Herald "feeling that the story is within the sensitive area of national policy, withheld publication until after the matter was aired in Washington." The Herald broke the story on the Tuesday after Senator George A. Smathers of Florida had disclosed the existence of one group on a Sunday night radio show.

The Herald's queasy phrases are disturbing. It is the job of a free press to report law violations, particularly when they may have the tacit support of government agencies. The CIA may be "sensitive" about such reporting but has that become a standard of self-censorship? These groups are operating openly; in fact neighbors complained to the police about them. The incident illustrates the way developments which are known in one city or State may be kept from public knowledge elsewhere. We are on a new frontier of government-press relations in which official agencies and nervous nellie editors can and do conspire to keep the public un- or mis-informed.

"each nation will be permitted to fashion . . . the kind of modern society it wants." Is this why we try to marshall the hemisphere against Castro? He speaks of "our 'religious and philosophical beliefs' about the 'uniqueness of each individual.'" How much concern is there for the individual in the present regimes of South Korea, South Viet-Nam, Taiwan, Pakistan and Iran which he names as the special objects

Fulbright Warns Against the New Vogue For "Dirty Tricks" in Our Foreign Policy

"My fear is that many Americans, including some whose judgment is generally good, are drawing the wrong conclusions. . . . The lesson of Cuba, they suggest, is that the objective was the correct one, but that the means employed were inadequate. And they further suggest that any means by which we can block Communist encroachment in our hemisphere garden is the proper course of action. . . .

"It is suggested with some frequency that U.S. policies would be improved by an infusion of the more mischievous tactics employed by the Communists; that with some application we could beat the Communists at their own game. This, I think, totally misses the real nature of the struggle. . . .

"It is not our affluence, or our plumbing, or our clogged freeways that grip the imagination of others. Rather it is the values upon which our system is built. These values imply our adherence not only to liberty and individual freedom, but also to international peace, law and order, and constructive social purpose. . . . If we are faithful to our own values, while following an intelligent courageous and consistent line or policy, we are likely to find a high measure of the support we seek abroad. But if we fail our own values and ideals, ultimately we shall have failed ourselves. . . .

"Some may object that, as a practical matter, the fire spread by communism can be fought effectively only with fire. I disagree. . . . The U.S. cannot guarantee the borders of a neutral country against infiltration, or its villages from subversion. But the U.S. can become a pivotal force in enabling well-intentioned governments to bring about the economic and social reforms that their

societies are understandably enough insisting upon. Given such reforms, subversion efforts fail. . . .

"Cuba, of course, for all intents and purposes, has been transformed into a Communist oriented, totalitarian state. It is idle to expect the present Cuban regime to reform, to collapse, or to be overthrown by its exiles. And I submit that to overthrow it by American force, or by some combination including American force, would be self-defeating and would create more problems than would be solved. We often hear that the existence of a Communist regime in Cuba is intolerable to the United States. But is that really the case? I know it is embarrassing and annoying and potentially dangerous, but is it really intolerable?

"The possibility of Soviet missile bases and jet aircraft bases in Cuba is frequently noted. I suppose we would all be less comfortable if the Soviets did install missile bases in Cuba, but I am not sure that our national existence would be in substantially greater danger than is the case today. Nor do I think that such bases would substantially alter the balance of power in the world.

"What would substantially alter the balance of power in the world would be precipitate action by the U.S. resulting in the alienation of most of Latin America, Asia and Africa. . . . In Latin America, as in much of the rest of the world, the question is being posed: Can social and economic progress proceed apart from totalitarian discipline? It is our duty to provide a credible case for the affirmative side of this debate. Our economic and philosophical resources, if wisely used, should enable us to succeed."—Fulbright's Speech to the U.S. Senate June 29

... Now Being Waged In The Upper Levels of the Kennedy Administration

of our solicitude? The equanimity with which we watch the rise of new military dictatorships as in Korea and the complacency with which we gloss over the Fascist character of such regimes as Diem's in South Viet-Nam contrast too strongly with our implacable hostility to revolutionary governments like Castro's which have dared to expropriate American properties.

No Guerrillas in the Congo

Prof. Rostow lumps together Cuba, the Congo, Laos and Viet-Nam as similar examples of what he calls the "international disease" of "guerrilla war designed, initiated, supplied and led from outside an independent nation." But these are very different situations. There was no guerrilla warfare in the Congo; there our CIA connived with the Belgians to get rid of Lumumba because he would not knuckle under to Western capital. Castro's movement in its guerrilla phase was opposed by the Communists until his victory was imminent. In Laos, it was we who upset a neutral government and provoked a civil war. As for divided Viet-Nam, we blocked the elections for reunification pledged by the Geneva accords of 1954. We opposed elections in Viet-Nam for the same reason Moscow opposes it in Germany—neither power favors elections where it is sure to lose them.

Any intellectual in the underdeveloped areas reading this speech against the backdrop of recent events is apt to conclude that our policy is much like that of Moscow's. Both sides believe the end justifies the means; *they* want a world safe for communism, we want a world safe for capitalism. Where the sanctity of investments is honored, we overlook any assault on the rights of the individual. Behind the

How High Officials Can Be Carried Away By Their Own Hot Air

"We seek two results: first, that truly independent nations shall emerge on the world scene; and, second, that each nation will be permitted to fashion, out of its own culture and its own ambitions, the kind of modern society it wants. The same religious and philosophical beliefs which decree that we respect the uniqueness of each individual, make it natural that we respect the uniqueness of each national society."

—Rostow at Fort Bragg June 28 (see box below)

"The U.S. has lifted its last restrictions on Dominican exiles who wish to return to the Dominican Republic. A ban was first imposed after the assassination May 30 of the Dominican dictator, Trujillo. Alfonso Canto, coordinator of the Dominican Liberation Movement, had charged that the original order preventing all Dominicans from returning home was amended to a list of 109, blocking primarily his group.

"Senor Canto said the U.S. has permitted travel by persons approved by the CIA and was trying 'to establish a puppet government.' In Washington, State and Justice Dept. officials said yesterday only that the travel had been curbed 'in the best interests of the United States.' . . . The Dominican Liberation Movement has been critical of U.S. support for the invasion of Cuba in April."

—New York Times (City Edition) July 4

gilded rhetoric of a Prof. Rostow are the cynical brutalities of military and intelligence agencies operating on the basis of anti-communist oversimplifications and as arrogantly bipolar a view of the world as Moscow's. It is Senator Fulbright who speaks for our better selves.

Rostow Salutes U.S. Guerrilla Fighters As He Would "Doctors, Teachers . . ."

"When this Administration came to responsibility it faced four major crises: Cuba, the Congo, Laos and Viet-Nam. Each represented a successful Communist breaching—over the previous two years—of the Cold War truce lines which had emerged from the Second World War and its aftermath. In different ways each had arisen from the efforts of the international Communist movement to exploit the inherent instabilities of the underdeveloped areas of the non-Communist world, and each had a guerrilla warfare component. Cuba, of course, differed from the other cases. The Cuban revolution against Batista was a broad-based national insurrection. But that revolution was tragically captured from within by the Communist apparatus; and now Latin America faces the danger of Cuba's being used as the base for training, supply and direction of guerrilla warfare in the Hemisphere.

"More than that, Mr. Khrushchov, in his report to the Moscow conference of Communist parties (January 6, 1961) had explained at great length that the Communists fully support what he called wars of national liberation and would march in the front rank with the peoples waging such struggles. The military aim of Mr. Khrushchov's January 1961 doctrine is, clearly, guerrilla warfare. . . .

"Our central task in the underdeveloped areas, as we see it, is to protect the independence of the revolutionary process now going forward. . . . We are committed by the nature of our system, to support the cause of national independence. . . . The victory we seek . . . will not be a victory of the United States over the Soviet Union. It will not be a victory of capitalism over socialism. It will be a victory of men and nations which aim to stand up

straight, over the forces which wish to entrap and exploit their revolutionary aspirations. . . .

"To make this vision come true places a great burden on the U.S. at this phase of history. The preservation of independence has many dimensions. The U.S. has the primary responsibility for deterring the use of nuclear weapons in the pursuit of Communist ambitions. The U.S. has a major responsibility to deter the kind of overt aggression with conventional forces, which was launched in June 1950 in Korea. The U.S. has the primary responsibility for assisting the economies of those hard pressed states on the periphery of the Communist bloc . . . for example, South Korea, Viet-Nam, Taiwan, Pakistan, Iran. The U.S. has a special responsibility of leadership in bringing not merely its own resources but resources of all the Free World to bear in aiding the long-run development of those nations which are serious about modernizing their economy and their social life. . . .

"Finally the U.S. has a role to play—symbolized by your presence here and mine—in learning to deter guerrilla warfare, if possible, and to deal with it, if necessary. . . . We are determined to help destroy this international disease; that is, guerrilla war designed, initiated, supplied and led from outside an independent nation. . . . This requires, of course, not merely a proper military program of deterrence, but programs of village development, communications and indoctrination. . . .

"I salute you as I would a group of doctors, teachers, economic planners, agricultural experts, civil servants, or those others who are now leading the way in the whole southern half of the globe in fashioning new nations. . . ."

—W. W. Rostow at the U.S. Army Special Warfare School, Fort Bragg, North Carolina, June 28.

Just Because the Russians *Might* Test, Doesn't Mean the U.S. *Must*

(Continued from Page One)

several communications from friendly nations, as well as important neutral nations, urging upon us not to resume these tests. In fact, one of our major allies finds it a major political issue." Why should these matters be withheld from public knowledge, especially since their publication would set up counter pressure against testing and thus give the President greater freedom of action? The other point made by Humphrey which deserves fuller public discussion is that the Russians to get a Polaris style missile or more compact warheads for their rockets must test openly, at sea, in the atmosphere or in outer space—not underground. Such tests can, of course, be monitored from afar, they cannot be conducted secretly.

Any Neutron Bomb Is A Long Way From Testing

The trouble with the inquiry ordered by the President June 28 from his Scientific Advisory Committee is that the questions put to it are too limited. The No. 1 question, which the President did not mention, is whether, irrespective of what the Russians do, we have any real need at this time for testing. The President himself told the UPI conference here in Washington June 8, "I know of no test which is necessary at this time. . . ." The neutron bomb and the anti-missile missile are still long-shot fantasies, glints in somebody's eye, concepts a long way from the testing stage. If we have no immediate need to test anyway, we could take the issue to the UN Assembly, offer to abide by its decision and put the Russians on the spot. If they resume testing and we don't, I believe world public opinion would quickly force them to halt and for once we could win an inning with mankind. To narrow the study by the scientists to whether the Russians have been testing or could test clandestinely is to invite a foregone conclusion. There is no evidence that they have but there is no way to prove the negative proposition that they have not tested or could not test secretly. Here again the President's hands may be tied because the public has been led to assume—illogically—that we *must* test if there is a chance the Russians *might*.

An Act of Clemency by Kennedy

We rise to applaud President Kennedy for an act of kindness and considerable courage in ordering the release of Henry Winston, one of the 11 top Communists sent to jail in the Smith Act trial of 1949. Winston lost his sight while in prison; his family charged that delay by authorities in treating him for what turned out to be a brain tumor was responsible for his tragedy. Winston's plight was called forcibly to public attention when Fidel Castro named him and Albizu Campos, the jailed Puerto Rican Nationalist, as two of the political prisoners for whom he was prepared to exchange men captured by him in the abortive April invasion. It is a long time since a President of the United States dared to authorize an act of clemency for an imprisoned Communist; this so far as we can remember is the first time it has happened since the onset of the cold war.

In this connection we also welcome the action of the New Jersey State Supreme Court in voiding the disbarment of Abraham J. Isserman, who was one of the counsel for the defense in the 1949 trial. The contempt convictions imposed on counsel were long ago reversed on appeal, and it was time that Mr. Isserman was allowed return to practice. Chief Justice Joseph Weintraub earns respect by this calm decision.

¶ The President ought to put Adlai Stevenson in charge of the newly projected peace agency. The bill to establish it, which went to the Congress last week, is excellent but everything depends on its direction. If Wm. C. Foster is named to head it, as at present reported, we will be putting in charge a man associated with plans to step up the cold war and pleas for greater arms expenditure. The whole moral effect will be lost; it will look like a propagandistic gesture to cloak a resumed arms race. Only an American of first rank whose name symbolizes peace can make this project meaningful. Stevenson is the ideal man for the job. He is being morally ruined as errand boy for the State Department in the UN, shamed by our falsehoods on Cuba, and stultified by our phoney policies on the Congo. This agency could again make him a national asset if he were given a free hand to run it.

Noon, July 5

PLEASE Send Long Envelopes Stamped If You Want Free Samples of Any Issue Sent to Friends

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed \$5:*

Name

Street

City Zone.....State.....

7/10/61

Enter gift sub for \$2 (6 mos.) or \$4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name

Street

City Zone.....State.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.

Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Second class

postage paid

at

Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: \$5 in the U. S.; \$6 in Canada; \$10 elsewhere. All Mail rates: \$15 to Europe; \$20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.